USIGS Interoperability Profile (UIP) Working Group

11 June 97

Bill Nell - LMC/M&DS (VF)
(610) 531-6012
(610) 962-3698 - fax
william.h.nell@lmco.com

Agenda

- **Welcome/Admin/Introductions** — **Nell (LMC)**
- **USIGS System Architecture Activities** — **Housel (NIMA)**
- **Mods to GIAS 3.0 Spec** — **Green (SCI)**
- **UIP RFC 5/30 Draft Review** — **Nell**
  - **Summary of changes from CIIP**
  - **Review of comments received**
  - **Changes in progress to 5/30 Draft**
  - **UIP Remaining Issues**
- **UIP RFC Plans and Schedule** — **Nell**
- **GIAS Interoperability Test Plans** — **Green**
- **Wrap-up and Actions** — **All**
- **Adjourn**

Summary of Changes-5/30 Draft

- **Name change: CIIP -> UIP**
- **Section 1-**
  - **Changed to reflect role of UIP in USIGS Architecture**
- **Section 2 - No changes (yet)**
- **Section 3 - Architectural Framework deleted pending replacement**
  - **Intend to reference USIGS Technical Architecture**

Summary of Changes-5/30 Draft

- **Section 4 - Interoperability Requirements**
  - **Expanded list of Applicable Systems**
  - **Infrastructure Services - Now points to JTA**
  - **IAS profile replaced by GIAS profile**
  - **Placeholders added for other services IAW draft USIGS Technical Architecture**
  - **Additional data formats added - Raster, Vector, Grid**
  - **Added "USIGS Standard Metadata File" format**
  - **Added Video Core Metadata**
  - **Added reference to USIGS Data Model**
- **Section 5-7 - No changes (yet)**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: Incomplete access_criteria() return value.**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 4**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 2 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION: The UIP does not define what is contained in the value part of the name value list for the access_criteria() method.**

9. **CONCLUSION: The values must be described. If nothing is defined the client cannot expect to get anything. This is not testable.**

10. **RECOMMENDATION: Specify the value be a Boolean where True indicates the name is required, and False indicates the name is optional.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: Use of "etc."**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 6**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 2 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION: Use of "etc." makes the value untestable since etc. does not limit the value.**

Applies to: ArchiveDescription.

9. **CONCLUSION: See discussion.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: See discussion.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: archiveName format.**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 7**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 2 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION: The format "XXXnnnn" limits the library type to 3 characters. What about systems like IDEX, DAGS, etc.**

Applies to: ArchiveDescription.

9. **CONCLUSION: See discussion.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: See discussion.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Corrected - Format changed to "XXXXXXXXnnnn".**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: ArchiveList Inconsistency**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 9**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 3 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION: The GIAS typedef's the ArchiveList to be a sequence<Archive>, and the Archive is an interface object reference. The UIP shows the ArchiveList as a sequence<string>.**
9. **CONCLUSION: The GIAS and UIP do not define ArchiveList as the same type.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: Remove the definition of ArchiveList from the UIP.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: Units for request lifetimes.**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 10**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 3 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION: The GIAS defines the lifetime of requests as longs but the units are not defined.**

Applies to: defaultTimeOut(), currentTimeOut(), changeTimeOut().

If the client does not set the defaultTimeOut, what does the server use for a default? Is there a way to specify a indefinite timeout?

9. **CONCLUSION: See discussion.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: Specify the units in the UIP as seconds.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: Order of Manager interfaces.**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 11**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 3 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION: The order of the manager interfaces are not the same as the GIAS. By putting them in the same order as the GIAS they are easier to find.**

Recommend putting them in the following order, Manager, RequestManager, AccessManager, other managers.

Note, if the use modes are different for the different manager types then the description(s) of the use modes would need to be put with each manager.

9. **CONCLUSION: See discussion.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: Add information to the UIP.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: CatalogAccessManager properties**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 12**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 3 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION:**

UIP page 32 shows the properties that are "settable" for the CatalogAccessManager interface. Change the default value for BrowseImageReturned to False and ResultAttribures to a zero length list. This would reduce the default bandwidth.

Page 38 appears to show the "readonly" properties for the CatalogAccessManager, but its position is such that they appear to be global for all inherited manager interfaces. Since the "readonly" properties are different between manager types, put the with each manager type.

Specify MaxPolygonVerticies as equal to or greater than 3.

Does the QueryableAttributes no longer define the allowable operators for the attribute as described in the IAS?

9. **CONCLUSION: See discussion.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: See discussion.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. ISSUE TITLE: QueryableAttributes
2. ISSUE NUMBER: 15
3. DOCUMENT: UIP
4. DATE: 3 June 97
5. ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA
6. POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494
7. STATUS: OPEN
8. DISCUSSION:
How does the client know which attributes are queryable as text_attributes or geo_attributes. The IAS provides this information as the value in the NameValueList.

9. CONCLUSION: See discussion.
10. RECOMMENDATION: See discussion.
11. RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: RequestDescription.request_type**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 16**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 4 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION: The string "GeoAccess" could be confused with the "GeoDataSetManager" or "GeoFeatureManager"**

9. **CONCLUSION: See discussion.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: Change "GeoAccess" to DataSetAccess".**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: Callback.**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 17**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 4 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION:**

The Request interface implies the client can register more than one callback object reference. It seems that more than one callback and access to the request object could create a problem accessing the query results.

It seems the server should call the Callback::released() when the client calls the freeCallback method on the request.

9. **CONCLUSION: See discussion.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: Further review.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Comments Received

1. **ISSUE TITLE: Email Callback.**
2. **ISSUE NUMBER: 18**
3. **DOCUMENT: UIP**
4. **DATE: 4 June 97**
5. **ACTION ORGANIZATION: NIMA**
6. **POINTS OF CONTACT: Dave Mann, JITC. 520-538-5494**
7. **STATUS: OPEN**
8. **DISCUSSION:**

How does the recipient of the email callback know what request the callback is from?

Where in the email does the user_message go, in the title, the body? If in the body, what goes into the email title?

Can the email callback be released like the object reference callback?

Can more than one email callback be requested?

9. **CONCLUSION: The content of the email message is not defined.**
10. **RECOMMENDATION: Prescribe the content of the email in the UIP.**
11. **RESOLUTION: Forthcoming.**

Changes in Progress

- **Adding TACO2 to Infrastructure Services**
- **Adding EO,IR,MS Airborne SDE specifications pending NTB approval**
- **Adding mandatory metadata to imagery and video metadata profiles**
- **Standard User Profile Info**

Remaining UIP Issues

- **Applicable Systems**
- **GIAS Interface Support**
- **Effectivities**
- **GIAS Parms**
- **File formats**
  - **NITF 2.1/BIIF/NSIF**
- **NITFS Low Bit Rate Compression**
- **Standard Metadata File**
  - **Bulk Metadata Transfer**
  - **IIE Auto-Populate**
- **Queryable Metadata**

Near Term Schedule

- **First Draft UIP - 30 May (Complete)**
  - **Based on 15 May GIAS Spec release**
- **Updated Interoperability Test Profile - 6 June (Complete)**
- **UIP Working Group Meeting - 11 June (Today)**
- **Second Draft UIP - 20 June**
- **ICWG - 24-26 June (in VF)**
  - **Status briefing and Side Session**
- **UIP Working Group Meeting (DC Area) - 2 July**
- **RFC Release - 22 July**